| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/799,363 | 03/12/2004 | Frank Beunings | 34874-090 UTIL | 6370 |

64280          7590          08/26/2009
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| ANYA, CHARLES E |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2194 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 08/26/2009 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 May 2009</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**        2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-6,8-12 and 14</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-6,8-12 and 14</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)        5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
       Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.                6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-12 and 14 are pending in this application.


### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.


2.      **Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

**unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0217176 A1 to Beunings in view of U.S. Pub.**

**No. 2004/0193687 A1 to Christensen et al.**


3.      As to claim 1, Beunings teaches a computer-implemented method of accessing

content of a message, comprising:

defining a context object for inclusion in a message, the context object being an

abstraction of content of the message ("…routing object…" page 1 paragraphs

0006/0007, Routing Object 234 page 2 paragraph 0024, "…define routing object…"

page 5 paragraphs 0043/0048), the context object defined in a repository

("…directory…" page 1 paragraph 0007, "…repository…" page 1 paragraph 0008,

Repository 202 page 2 paragraph 0022, page 5 paragraph 0050);

assigning the context object to one or more interfaces through which the message is to be communicated ("…(API)…" page 1 paragraph 0007, "…required interface…" page 4 paragraphs 0038, "…routing model…API…" page 4 paragraphs 0041/0042, "…relate them to any outbound interface 238…" page 5 paragraph 0050), the context object used to select a send process for the message sent to at least one of the assigned interfaces ("…information about the routing objects is used for receiver determination…" page 2 paragraph 0024, "…the application can read the values of all routing objects supported by all the outbound interface and ask the routing model directory for the receivers of a message..." page 6 paragraph 0056); and

accessing, via the context object, the content of the message at one of the interfaces (Routing Objects 234 page 2 paragraph 0024).

Beunings is silent with reference to the context object including a name and a namespace, the name of the context object used to access payload information.

Christensen teaches the context object including a name and a namespace, the name of the context object used to access payload information (Message Object/Header Collection 110 page 2 paragraph 0027, "….the message header collection 110…XML element name of the header, the XML namespace in which the header is defined…" page 3 paragraph 0032).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Beunings with the teaching of Christensen because the teaching of Christensen would improve the system of Beunings by

providing a mechanism to distinguish names used in XML documents and thus, allowing

to keep these names simple and meaningful while unique.


4.     As to claim 2, Beunings teaches a computer-implemented method in accessing

content of a message, comprising:

       defining a context object for inclusion in a message, the context object being an

abstraction of content of the message ("…routing object…" page 1 paragraphs

0006/0007, Routing Object 234 page 2 paragraph 0024, "…define routing object…"

page 5 paragraphs 0043/0048), the context object stored in a repository ("…directory…"

page 1 paragraph 0007, "…repository…" page 1 paragraph 0008, Repository 202 page

2 paragraph 0022, page 5 paragraph 0050), including criteria to enable reuse across

one or more interfaces, the context object providing the criteria for determining one or

more send steps at one of the interfaces ("…can be used in more than one outbound

interface 238…" page 5 paragraph 0051);

       assigning, to the one or more interfaces through which the message is to be

communicated ("…(API)…" page 1 paragraph 0007, "…required interface…receiver

interface…" page 4 paragraphs 0038, "…routing model…API…" page 4 paragraphs

0041/0042, "…customers can define their own routing objects 234, and relate them to

any outbound interface 238…" page 5 paragraph 0050), the context object describing

the message (Routing Object 234), the context object used to select a send process for

the message sent to at least one of the assigned interfaces ("…information about the

routing objects is used for receiver determination…" page 2 paragraph 0024, "…the

application can read the values of all routing objects supported by all the outbound

interface and ask the routing model directory for the receivers of a message..." page 6

paragraph 0056); and

accessing, via the context object, the content of the message at one of the

interfaces, wherein accessing the content includes accessing application data

associated with the context object (Routing Objects 234 page 2 paragraph 0024).

Beunings is silent with reference to the context object including a name and a

namespace, the name of the context object used to access payload information.

Christensen teaches the context object including a name and a

namespace, the name of the context object used to access payload information

(Message Object/Header Collection 110 page 2 paragraph 0027, "….the message

header collection 110…XML element name of the header, the XML namespace in which

the header is defined…" page 3 paragraph 0032).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to modify the system of Beunings with the teaching of Christensen

because the teaching of Christensen would improve the system of Beunings by

providing a mechanism to distinguish names used in XML documents and thus, allowing

to keep these names simple and meaningful while unique.


5.      As to claim 4, Beunings teaches a method in accordance with claim 1, further

comprising storing the context object in a repository accessible by a runtime engine to

communicate with the one or more interfaces ("...routing model..." page 4 paragraph

0042)


6.      As to claim 5, Christensen teaches a method in accordance with claim 4, wherein

the storing the context object includes storing a name and a namespace ("...request-

message context object..." page 5 paragraph 0054).


7.      As to claims 6, Beuning teaches  a system for exchanging messages,

comprising:

        a computer (System 100); and

        a memory (System 100) including a computer program code configured to

provide:

        one or more message interfaces, through which messages are received from a

sender or sent to one or more receivers ("...outbound interface...inbound interface..."

page 1 paragraph 0005, Interface 238 page 3 paragraph 0025, page 4 paragraph 0037,

"...APIs..." page 4 paragraph 0042, page 5 paragraphs 0050/0051); and

        a repository storing a plurality of context objects for  inclusion in a message

("...directory..." page 1 paragraph 0007, "...repository..." page 1 paragraph 0008,

Repository 202 page 2 paragraph 0022, page 5 paragraph 0050), wherein each context

object is an abstraction of content of the message, and wherein each context object is

assigned to at least one of the one or more interfaces to facilitate access to content of

the messages communicated through the message interfaces ("...routing object..."

page 1 paragraphs 0006/0007, Routing Object 234 page 2 paragraph 0024, "…define
routing object…" page 5 paragraphs 0043/0048), each context object is further used to
select a send process for the messages sent through the message interfaces
("…information about the routing objects is used for receiver determination…" page 2
paragraph 0024, "…the application can read the values of all routing objects supported
by all the outbound interface and ask the routing model directory for the receivers of a
message..." page 6 paragraph 0056).

Beunings is silent with reference to the context object including a name and a
namespace, the name of the context object used to access payload information.

Christensen teaches the context object including a name and a namespace, the
name of the context object used to access payload information (Message
Object/Header Collection 110 page 2 paragraph 0027, "….the message header
collection 110…XML element name of the header, the XML namespace in which the
header is defined…" page 3 paragraph 0032).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention was made to modify the system of Beunings with the teaching of Christensen
because the teaching of Christensen would improve the system of Beunings by
providing a mechanism to distinguish names used in XML documents and thus, allowing
to keep these names simple and meaningful while unique.


8.       As to claim 8, Beunings teaches a system in accordance with claim 6, further
comprising a directory that stores a plurality of routing rules for routing messages

between a sender and one or more receivers through one or more message interfaces

(Integration Directory 204 page 2 paragraph 0028).


9.      As to claim 9, Beunings teaches a system in accordance with claim 8, wherein

the context objects are assigned to the one or more interfaces according to one or more

business processes stored in the directory ("…(API)…" page 1 paragraph 0007,

"…required interface…receiver interface…" page 4 paragraphs 0038, "…routing

model…API…" page 4 paragraphs 0041/0042, "…relate them to any outbound interface

238…" page 5 paragraphs 0044/0050).


10.     As to claim 10, Beunings teaches a system in accordance with claim 9, further

comprising an integration server for executing the one or more business processes

(Integration Server 206 page 2 paragraph 0019, page 5 paragraph 0045).


11.     As to claim 11, Beunings teaches a computer program product containing

instructions to configure a computer to perform a method, the method comprising:

        defining a context object for inclusion in a message, the context object being an

abstraction of content of the message ("…routing object…" page 1 paragraphs

0006/0007, Routing Object 234 page 2 paragraph 0024, "…define routing object…"

page 5 paragraphs 0043/0048), the context object stored in a repository ("…directory…"

page 1 paragraph 0007, "…repository…" page 1 paragraph 0008, Repository 202 page

2 paragraph 0022, page 5 paragraph 0050);

assigning the context object to one or more interfaces through which the

message is to be communicated ("…(API)…" page 1 paragraph 0007, "…required

interface…receiver interface…" page 4 paragraphs 0038, "…routing model…API…"

page 4 paragraphs 0041/0042, "…customers can define their own routing objects 234,

and relate them to any outbound interface 238…" page 5 paragraph 0050); and

accessing, via the context object, the content of the message at one of the

interfaces ("…(API)…" page 1 paragraph 0007, "…required interface…receiver

interface…" page 4 paragraphs 0038, "…routing model…API…" page 4 paragraphs

0041/0042, "…customers can define their own routing objects 234, and relate them to

any outbound interface 238…" page 5 paragraph 0050), the context object used to

select a send process for the message sent to at least one of the assigned interfaces

("…information about the routing objects is used for receiver determination…" page 2

paragraph 0024, "…the application can read the values of all routing objects supported

by all the outbound interface and ask the routing model directory for the receivers of a

message..." page 6 paragraph 0056).

Beunings is silent with reference to the context object including a name and a

namespace, the name of the context object used to access payload information.

Christensen teaches the context object including a name and a namespace, the

name of the context object used to access payload information (Message

Object/Header Collection 110 page 2 paragraph 0027, "….the message header

collection 110…XML element name of the header, the XML namespace in which the

header is defined…" page 3 paragraph 0032).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to modify the system of Beunings with the teaching of Christensen

because the teaching of Christensen would improve the system of Beunings by

providing a mechanism to distinguish names used in XML documents and thus, allowing

to keep these names simple and meaningful while unique.

12.     As to claim 12, Beunings teaches a computer program product in accordance

with claim 11, wherein accessing the content includes accessing application data

associated with the context object (Routing Objects 234 page 2 paragraph 0024).

13.     As to claim 14, see the rejection of claim 4 above.

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 6/18/09 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant argues in substance that (1) the Beunings prior art does not teach

"context object' as claimed because the "routing object" of the Beunings prior art is a not

abstraction of the content of the message, (2) the "routing object" does not include a

name and namespace, and (3)

The Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's arguments:

As to point (1), contrary to Applicant's argument the Examiner believes the "routing object" is functional equivalent to the claimed "context object". The instant disclosure describes the "context object" as follows:

1).    "The context object provides access both to a message payload, and parts of a message..." page 2 paragraph 0004).

2).    "Information about the context objects 234 are used in determining receiving application(s)..." (page 4 paragraph 0016)

3).    "Context Object 234 are predefined criteria to determine potential receivers of messages that must be distributed between software components and business partners during collaborating processing" (page 4 paragraph 0016).

Similarly the Beunings prior art discloses the following:

1).    "Routing objects 234 are pointers that point to a specific part of a message" (page 2 paragraph 0024).

2).    "Information about the routing objects is used for receiver determination" page 2 paragraph 0024)

3).    "Routing Object 234...They are predefined criteria to determine potential receivers of messages that must be distributed between components and business partners during collaborating processing" (page 2 paragraph 0024).

Items 1-3 of the instant disclosure is functional equivalent to items 1-3 of the Beuning prior art respectively.


As to point (2), this argument is moot in view of the current rejection.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHARLES E. ANYA whose telephone number is (571)272-3757. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung Sough can be reached on 571-272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Charles E Anya/
Examiner, Art Unit 2194